

Phenomenological theory of mode collapse-revival in confined Bose gas

L.P. Pitaevskii

Department of Physics, Technion, 32000 Haifa, Israel

and

Kapitza Institute for Physical Problems, 117454 Moscow, Russia

(January 2, 1997)

Abstract

A phenomenological theory of mode collapse-revival for a system with a weak nonlinearity is presented. The theory takes into account fluctuations of the number n of quanta of oscillations. The collapse time τ_c^{-1} for a mode of frequency ω_0 turns out to be $\omega_0(\sqrt{n/2}\hbar\omega_0 | \nu |)$, where ν is a coefficient in a nonlinear correction to the mode frequency with respect to the oscillation energy E . For a Bose gas in a harmonic trap τ_c is order of $\omega_0^{-1}\sqrt{\mu N/E\hbar\omega_0}$. This value is order of 250 ms. for typical experimental conditions. The coefficient ν is calculated for the breathing mode in an isotropic trap.

The recent discovery of Bose-Einstein condensation of alkali atoms [1] confined in magnetic traps has opened a new important field of investigation of quantum phenomena on a macroscopic scale. The most interesting possibility is to observe specific quantum phenomena which have no classical analogy. One such phenomenon is the collapse and revival of coherent quantum states recently observed for an atom in a electromagnetic field in a resonant cavity [2] . The problem has a developed theoretical background, and for a comprehensive discussion see in Ref. [3].

Several significant works have been carried out recently about manifestation of this phenomenon in Bose-condensed gases. In paper [4] properties of a ground state are discussed. Kuklov et. al. [5] considered dephasing of a finite amplitude oscillation in a finite Bose system because of atom occupation number fluctuations in the oscillation. They suggested that this mechanism can explain the observed damping of oscillations and used a microscopic model to calculate the collapse time and they concluded that the theory can give a reasonable order of magnitude of this time compared to the damping observed in experiments [6], [7]. In [8] the authors considered the dephasing because of the zero-point fluctuations of occupation numbers of atoms. Since the authors have withdrawn the paper we don't discuss it in detail. Note only that we believe that zero-point fluctuations cannot result in the effect under consideration.

In this paper we will present a general phenomenological theory of collapse-revival of a highly excited mode of oscillation of a superfluid Bose system. We will take into account not fluctuations of occupation numbers of atoms but rather fluctuations in the numbers of quanta of oscillations of the mode. (This is by no means the same for low-frequency oscillations.) We believe that this choice of variables is more proper then used in [5]. The physical meaning of the effect is that a coherent oscillation is a linear combination of stationary states of a system and the number of quanta is a natural specification of a stationary state of an oscillator. In this way one doesn't meet the troublesome problem of diagonalization of the Hamiltonian. Of course a problem can be solved in any variables and a microscopic theory always gives more information about some mechanism of the effect. From another side, the

phenomenological approach is more transparent and gives direct possibility for comparison with an experiment.

According to general theory [3] the effect in consideration is based on the fact that transition frequencies for stationary component of a coherent state of the system are different. This effect doesn't exist for a purely harmonic oscillator and hence is completely defined by non-linearity. In [3] a two-level system in an electromagnetic field has been considered. One may say that this is a limiting case of an extremely strong nonlinearity. For our system however the opposite case of weak nonlinearity is more proper.

First of all we will present the collapse-revival theory in a form more suitable for our purpose. In the case of weak nonlinearity the frequency of the oscillation mode under consideration can be written as:

$$\omega = \omega_0 + \delta\omega = \omega_0(1 + \nu E), \quad (1)$$

where E is an energy of oscillations, and $|\nu| E \ll 1$ (weak non-linearity). Stress that constant ν describing the first nonlinear correction has a purely classical meaning. For an anharmonic oscillator with a Hamiltonian $H = p^2/2m + m\omega_0^2 x^2/2 + \alpha x^3/3 + \beta x^4/4$ one has:

$$\nu = -\frac{5\alpha^2}{6m^3\omega_0^6} + \frac{3\beta}{4m^2\omega_0^4}. \quad (2)$$

Taking into account that $\hbar\omega = (\partial E_n/\partial n)$, we can rewrite this equation in the quantum form

$$\omega_n = E_n/\hbar = \omega_0 n + bn^2/2, \quad (3)$$

where n is the number of quanta in the given excited state of the system ($n \gg 1$), E_n is the energy of the state and

$$b = \hbar\omega_0^2\nu. \quad (4)$$

Let us consider now a coherent state of our oscillator. Its wave function can be presented in the well-known form:

$$\psi = C \sum_n c_n \psi_n \exp(-i\omega_n t), \quad |c_n|^2 = \exp(-\bar{n}) \bar{n}^n / n!, \quad (5)$$

where ψ_n is a wave function of a stationary state of the oscillator where n quanta are excited, $\hbar\omega_0\bar{n} = E$. All quantities besides ω_n can be taken for a harmonic oscillator. In our case:

$$\bar{n} \gg 1, |c_n|^2 \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\bar{n}}} \exp\left(-\frac{(n-\bar{n})^2}{2\bar{n}}\right). \quad (6)$$

Let us calculate now an average value of the oscillator coordinate x using the wave function (5). Taking into account that only transitions $n \rightarrow n \pm 1$ are important, one gets:

$$\langle x(t) \rangle \approx \sum_n |C c_n|^2 \cos((\omega_0 + bn)t). \quad (7)$$

For small enough values of t we can replace the summation over n by integration. The result is Gaussian damping of amplitude of the oscillation according to:

$$\langle x \rangle \sim \exp(-\bar{n}b^2t^2/2) \equiv \exp(-(t/\tau_c)^2), \quad (8)$$

where

$$\tau_c^{-1} = (\sqrt{\bar{n}/2} | b |) = \omega_0(\sqrt{\bar{n}/2}\hbar\omega_0 | \nu |) = \omega_0(\sqrt{E\hbar\omega/2} | \nu |) \quad (9)$$

The periodicity of expression (7) gives immediately the revival period:

$$\tau_r = \frac{\pi}{\hbar\omega_0^2 | \nu |} \quad (10)$$

Note first of all that amplitude of the oscillations is proportional to $\sqrt{\bar{n}}$. Thus our phenomenological theory gives the same amplitude dependence of collapse time as the theory of Ref. [5]. We however didn't use so far any information about microscopic properties of our system. It means that the effect is not related in our description to the fact of Bose condensation. Every system possessing excitations with long enough lifetime is suitable. The coefficient ν can be calculated or measured and thus the theory contains no fitting parameters.

According to Eq.(9) the collapse time τ_c decreases with increase of $\bar{n}$. One must however take into account still that there is a restriction on the oscillation energy $| \nu | E \ll 1$, or:

$$1 \ll n \ll \frac{1}{\hbar\omega_0 | \nu |} \quad (11)$$

This inequality ensures applicability of the approximation of weak nonlinearity. It gives :

$$\tau_c \gg \tau_{min} \equiv \frac{1}{\omega_0 \sqrt{\hbar \omega_0 |\nu|}}. \quad (12)$$

The effect can be observed if this τ_{min} is less than the oscillation damping due to dissipation which is always present. The theory we presented is a rigorous one at conditions (11). To apply the theory to our problem of oscillations of Bose condensed gas in a harmonic magnetic trap one must calculate the nonlinearity coefficient ν . According to Stringari [9], the low frequency oscillations with frequency $\omega_0 \sim \omega_H$ are well described by equations of hydrodynamics if the number of atoms N is large enough. (ω_H is a frequency of oscillation of an isolated atom in the trap.) To observe the effect under consideration here one must try to have as small a number of atoms as possible. We however will use the hydrodynamics approximation taking into account that it works well for the present experimental conditions.

Calculation of the frequency shift (1) is straightforward but the procedure is a little bit cumbersome, because this shift appears at equations for third order terms with respect to the oscillation amplitudes. (Some results about amplitude dependence of the mode frequencies have been presented in Ref [10].) Having in view to estimate the order of magnitude of the effect we will restrict ourselves to the consideration of a spherical-symmetric breathing mode in an isotropic trap only. In this case the hydrodynamic velocity $\mathbf{v}$ has the form $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}) = u(t)\mathbf{r}$. Introducing a new variable w according to $u = \dot{w}/w$ one can reduce the equation for w to the form [10], [11]:

$$\ddot{w} + \omega_H^2 w - \omega_H^2/w^4 = 0. \quad (13)$$

Substitution $w(t) = 1 + x(t)$ and expansion with respect to x gives:

$$\ddot{x} + 5\omega_H^2 x = 20\omega_H^2 x^2 - 120\omega_H^2 x^3. \quad (14)$$

One has from (14):

$$x \approx A \cos(\omega_0 t), \omega_0 = \sqrt{5}\omega_H, \delta\omega/\omega_0 = (7/6)A^2. \quad (15)$$

(In fact A is a fractional amplitude of the oscillations in the cloud radius.)

The energy of oscillation can be calculated as twice the mean kinetic energy, $E = \int \rho_0 \bar{\mathbf{v}}^2 dV$, where $\rho_0(r)$ is the equilibrium density of condensate in a trap. Calculation gives $E = (3/7)N\mu A^2$, where μ is chemical potential of the gas, calculated in the Thomas-Fermi approximation. Thus the nonlinear shift coefficient ν turns out to be:

$$\nu = \frac{49}{18} \frac{1}{\mu N}. \quad (16)$$

This gives finally the collapse time for the mode under consideration:

$$\tau_c = \frac{18\sqrt{2}}{49} \omega_0^{-1} \frac{\mu N}{\sqrt{E\hbar\omega_0}} = \omega_0^{-1} \frac{0.79}{A} \sqrt{\frac{\mu N}{\hbar\omega_0}} \quad (17)$$

It is reasonable to think that equation (17) gives the correct order of magnitude for different collective modes, and holds even for a small number of atoms where the hydrodynamic approximation cannot be justified rigorously.

Let us estimate τ_c assuming typical experimental conditions of the paper [6]: $N = 4500$, $\omega_0/2\pi = 264$ Hz, $A = 0.2$. According to calculations of Ref. [12] $\sqrt{\mu N/\hbar\omega_0} = 104$. Then $\tau_c = 246$ ms. The authors of Ref. [6] reported that the lifetime of the low $m = 0$ mode is 110 ms. The calculated collapse time is in reasonable order of magnitude agreement with the observed value, however both experiments [6] and calculations [10] demonstrate absence of the amplitude dependence of frequency for this mode. Thus damping of this mode cannot be explained by the present version of the theory. Experimental conditions of [7] are less favourable for observation of the collapse because of the larger number of the condensed atoms.

One must take into account also that there is a different reason for nonlinear effects in our system because of trivial nonharmonic corrections to the magnetic trap confining potential which must be considered too.

More accurate calculations are in progress now. I hope that these calculations will disclose a mode which will be most suitable for observation of this effect. I would like to stress here that the first step to confirm the presented scenario of the damping is to discover predicted amplitude dependence.

It is reasonable to look for other suitable systems to apply the theory developed here. Liquid helium clusters and small piezoelectric samples are possible candidates.

In conclusion a general phenomenological theory of mode collapse and revival for a system with weak nonlinearity is presented. The theory doesn't contain any fitting parameters. The collapse time is expressed through a classical nonlinearity coefficient of the system. This coefficient is calculated for the breathing mode of the Bose condensate in a isotropic trap. The collapse time turns out to be about 250 ms for typical experimental conditions.

I would like to thank J. L. Birman for various enlightening discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. N. Anderson, J. R. Ensher, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman, and E. A. Cornell, Science **269**, 198 (1995); C. C. Bradley, C. A. Sacket, J. J. Tollet, and R. G. Hulet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1687 (1995); K. B. Davis, M.-O. Mewes, M. R. Andrews, N. J. van Druten, D. S. Durfee, D. M. Kurn, and W. Ketterly, *ibid.* **75**, 3969 (1995).
- [2] D. E. Meekhof, C. Monroe, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1796 (1996); M. Brune, F. Schmidt-Kaler, A. Maali, J. Dreyer, E. Hagley, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1800 (1996).
- [3] N. B. Narozhny, J. J. Sanchez-Mondragon, and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. A **23**, 236 (1981).
- [4] E. M. Wright, D. F. Walls and J. C. Garrison, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2158 (1996).
- [5] A. B. Kuklov, N. Chencinski, A. M. Levine, W. M. Schreiber and J. L. Birman, unpublished (cond-mat/9611207 preprint).
- [6] D. S. Jin, J. R. Ensher, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wiemann and E. A. Cornell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 420 (1996).
- [7] M.-O. Mewes, M. R. Andrews, N. J. van Druten, D. M. Kurn, D. S. Durfee, C. G. Townsend and W. Ketterle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 988 (1996).
- [8] R. Graham, D. F. Walls and M. J. Collett, and E. M. Wright, unpublished (cond-mat/9612060 preprint)
- [9] S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1671 (1996).
- [10] F. Dalfovo, C. Minniti and S. Stringari, L. P. Pitaevskii, unpublished (cond-mat/9612175 preprint).
- [11] Y. Castin and R. Dum, unpublished, preprint 1996; Yu. Kagan, E. L. Surkov and G. V. Shlyapnikov, unpublished, preprint.

[12] F. Dalfovo and S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2477 (1996).